

BEFORE THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

WALTER GILBERT, DALE PARKER,  
WILLIAM WARGO, ROBERT WOOTEN,  
DAVE FAWCETT, & JON REYNOLDSON,

Appellants,

v.

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,

Respondent.

Case Nos. ALLO-00-0044 - ALLO-00-0049

ORDER OF THE BOARD FOLLOWING  
HEARING ON EXCEPTIONS TO THE  
DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR

**Hearing on Exceptions.** These appeals came on for consolidated hearing before the Personnel Appeals Board, GERALD L. MORGEN, Vice Chair, and LEANA D. LAMB, Member. The hearing was held on March 7, 2001, in the Personnel Appeals Board hearing room in Olympia, Washington. WALTER T. HUBBARD, Chair, did not participate in the hearing or in the decision in these matters.

**Appearances.** Appellants Walter Gilbert, Dale Parker, William Wargo, Robert Wooten, Dave Fawcett, and Jon Reynoldson were present and were represented by Rick Engelhart, Business Agent for Teamsters Local 313. Shirley Reis, Human Resource Consultant, represented Respondent Department of Corrections (DOC).

**Background.** Appellants requested a review of the allocation of their Stationary Engineer 2 positions. By letter dated May 23, 2000, Respondent determined that Appellants' positions were properly allocated. On June 20, 2000, Appellants Parker, Wargo, Wooten, Fawcett and Reynoldson appealed DOC's decision to the Director of the Department of Personnel. On August 7, 2000, Appellant Gilbert appealed DOC's to the Director of the Department of Personnel.

1 The Director's designee, Paul Peterson, conducted a review of Appellants' positions. By letter  
2 dated October 18, 2000, the Director determined that Appellants' positions were properly allocated.  
3 On November 16, 2000, Appellants Gilbert, Parker, Wooten and Reynoldson filed exceptions to the  
4 Director's determination. On November 17, 2000, Appellants Wargo and Fawcett filed exceptions  
5 to the Director's determination. Appellants' exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

6 Appellants are employed at the MacNeil Island Correctional Center. Appellants are responsible for  
7 maintaining and operating the steam generation plant and auxiliary equipment during their shifts.  
8 Appellants are supervised by a Stationary Engineer 3.

9  
10 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellants argue that their responsibilities go beyond  
11 tending the power plant and assert that they have overall responsibility for the plant during their  
12 shifts. Appellants further argue that they supervise inmates as found in the typical work for the  
13 Stationary Engineer 3 classification. Appellants contend that they are required to respond to  
14 emergencies during their shifts and that their responsibilities include the North Complex and staff  
15 residences and well as the Correctional Center. Appellants contend that they have overall  
16 responsibility for the operation of the power plant and for inmate workers during their shifts, which  
17 is consistent with the definition of the Stationary Engineer 3 classification.

18  
19 **Summary of Respondent DOC's Argument.** Respondent argues that historically, the Stationary  
20 Engineer 3 classification has been used for the position that has the overall responsibility for the 24-  
21 hour operation of the power plant, which in this case, is Appellants' supervisor. Respondent asserts  
22 that Appellants are responsible for the power plant and associated facilities during their shifts only.  
23 Respondent contends that Appellants' positions fit the description of the Stationary Engineer 2  
24 classification.

25 **Primary Issue.** Whether the Director's determination that Appellants' positions should be  
26 allocated to the Stationary Engineer 2 classification should be affirmed.

1 **Relevant Classifications.** Stationary Engineer 2, class code 75120, and Stationary Engineer 3,  
2 class code 75140.

3  
4 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best  
5 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a  
6 measurement of the volume of work performed nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that  
7 work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in  
8 similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular  
9 position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the  
10 class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v.  
11 Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

12  
13 Salary inequity is not an allocation criteria and should not be considered when determining the  
14 appropriate allocation of a position. Even if class specifications become outdated as functions of  
15 positions evolve, the Personnel Appeals Board is not the proper entity to rewrite class  
16 specifications. Sorenson v. Dep't of Social and Health Services, PAB No. A94-020 (1995).

17 The Stationary Engineer 3 classification encompasses positions that supervise the total operation  
18 and maintenance of a high pressure heating plant consisting of two or more boilers over 150 h.p.  
19 each. Incumbents have final responsibility and authority for the overall safety, welfare, and  
20 maintenance within all operations of the plant. This classification is intended to encompass  
21 positions that have 24-hour responsibility for the plant. Appellants have responsibility for their  
22 shifts. They do not have final responsibility and authority for all operations of the plant.  
23 Appellants' positions do not have the level of responsibility required for allocation to the Stationary  
24 Engineer 3 classification.

1 The Stationary Engineer 2 classification encompasses positions that have shift responsibility for the  
2 operation of a high pressure power boiler system consisting of two or more boilers over 150 h.p.  
3 each. Incumbents are totally responsible for the operation of all generating equipment in the  
4 heating plant during his or her shift. In addition, incumbents must be able to exercise independent  
5 judgment and make decisions concerning operations and safety activities of the heating plant during  
6 his or her shift including providing work direction to skilled and semi-skilled workers. While this  
7 classification does not address Appellants' responsibility for the furnaces found in staff residences,  
8 Appellants' positions best fit within this description and their level of responsibility is consistent  
9 with the intent of the classification. Appellants' positions are best described by the Stationary  
10 Engineer 2 classification.

11 **Conclusion.** Appellants' appeals on exceptions should be denied and the determination of the  
12 Director, dated October 18, 2000, should be affirmed and adopted.  
13

14 **ORDER**

15 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeals on exceptions by Appellants is  
16 denied and the Director's determination dated October 18, 2000, is affirmed and adopted. A copy is  
17 attached.

18 DATED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2001.

19 WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

20  
21 \_\_\_\_\_  
Gerald L. Morgen, Vice, Chair

22  
23 \_\_\_\_\_  
Leana D. Lamb, Member